

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

KEITH HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 14-CV-722

DUDLEY H. BOWEN, et al.,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

On July 11, 2014, the Court dismissed the plaintiff's petition for mandamus in which it appeared that he wished to appeal judgments entered in several civil cases in other federal district courts. (Docket No. 5.) The Court cited to United States District Judge Dudley H. Bowen, Jr.'s order that the plaintiff was an abusive filer and that he was "enjoined from bringing any civil actions *in forma pauperis* in this or any other federal district court, except he may bring a civil action asserting that he is 'under imminent danger of serious physical injury.' 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)." (Docket No. 5; *In Re: Keith Henderson*, Case Number 3:12-mc-002-DHB, at 7 (S.D. Ga, Dec. 18, 2012)).

The plaintiff has now filed a motion to amend the complaint, a petition to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a statement alleging that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. In his motion to amend,

the plaintiff asserts that he wants to add a party. He also states that the original complaint names four defendants, but the individuals he lists as defendants are not named as defendants in the original petition. The plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* references a "capital case." Lastly, the plaintiff's statement that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury asserts that his life is in danger because he is housed with gang members at Wheeler Correctional Facility in Georgia. It is not entirely clear how these allegations relate to his original mandamus petition although it is possible that he seeks review in this Court of other district court decisions that addressed claims related to his transfer to Wheeler Correctional Facility.

The plaintiff is advised that he may be able to file an appeal to the appropriate federal court of appeals to review another district court's decision. He has not, however, shown that he is entitled to mandamus relief. *See Banks v. Sec'y of Ind. Family and Soc. Serv. Admin.*, 997 F.2d 231, 244 (7th Cir. 1993).

NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 6) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion to amend/correct complaint (ECF No. 10) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 14th day of August, 2015.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge